



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/651,406	08/30/2000	James C. Monberg	2590	9956

7590                  11/14/2003

LAW OFFICES OF ALBERT S MICHALIK PLLC  
704-228TH AVENUE NE  
SUITE 193  
SAMMAMISH, WA 98074

EXAMINER

MAHMOUDI, HASSAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2175	

DATE MAILED: 11/14/2003

||

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/651,406	MONBERG ET AL.
	Examiner Tony Mahmoudi	Art Unit 2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply:

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 October 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 14 October 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All
  - b) Some \*
  - c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application)
  - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or <sup>121</sup> *DOV POPOVIC* **SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER** TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 14-October-2003 has been entered.

### ***Remarks***

2. In response to the preliminary amendments filed on 14-October-2003, claim 22 has been amended, and new claims 25-29 are added per applicants' request. Therefore, claims 1-29 are presently pending in the application.
3. The formal drawings filed on 14-October-2003 are approved by the examiner.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2175

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunworth et al (U.S. patent No. 5,930,474) in view of Getchius et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,408,294.)

As to claim 1, Dunworth et al teaches in a computer system, a method (see column 2, lines 49-51) comprising:

maintaining location binding information (see column 24, lines 34-49, where “location binding information” is read on “address”, “city”, state”, and “zip code” fields”) associating a merchant with a plurality of listed regions (see column 38, line 66 through column 39, line5, and see figure 12), including at least one listed region in which the merchant provides service (see column 8, lines 37-44, and see column 24, lines 28-39, where “yellow pages” database is explained, and see column 37, lines 36-65);

receiving a request (see column 3, lines 1-2) directed to a particular region (see column 5, lines 22-24, and see figure 15);

searching the location binding information (see column 2, lines 54-58) associated with the merchant (see column 2, line 63 through column 3, line 14) to determine if the particular region matches at least one of the listed regions (see column 15, lines 23-25), and if so, returning information regarding the merchant (see column 16, lines 17-26, where “merchant” is read on “the specified value”).

Dunworth et al does not teach the merchant that does not include a physical location.

Art Unit: 2175

Getchius et al teaches a method and system for performing online data queries, in which he teaches the merchant that does not include a physical location (see column 18, lines 1-7, where “the merchant not having a physical location” is read on “virtual business”);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dunworth et al to include the merchant that does not include a physical location.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dunworth et al by the teaching of Getchius et al, because associating which the merchant that does not include a physical location would enable the user to obtain information about a business or a merchant who provides goods or services to the area but does not have a physical presence in that region. For example, it would make it possible to perform a search on, and obtain information about merchandise seller, “AMAZON.COM”, without AMAZON’s having to be physically present in the region the search is initiated from and/or the goods/services are delivered to.

As to claim 2, Dunworth et al as modified teaches wherein maintaining the location binding information (see Dunworth et al, column 24, lines 34-49, where “location binding information” is read on “address”, “city”, state”, and “zip code” fields”) comprises writing an entry into a database including information about each listed region (see Dunworth et al, column 8, line 59 through column 9, line 4, and see figure 12) and information about the merchant (see Dunworth et al, column 9, lines 55-67, where “merchant” is read on “business”, and see figure 18.)

As to claim 3, Dunworth et al as modified teaches the method further comprising returning additional information regarding the merchant (see Dunworth et al, column 3, lines 45-54, and see figure 11.)

As to claim 4, Dunworth et al as modified teaches wherein the additional information comprises text (see Dunworth et al, column 10, lines 16-28, and see column 19, lines 40-42.)

As to claim 5, Dunworth et al as modified teaches wherein the additional information comprises a glyph (see Dunworth et al, column 8, lines 25-30, and see column 10, lines 23-28, where “glyph” is read on “graphical image” and “graphical display”.)

As to claim 6, Dunworth et al as modified teaches a computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions for performing the method (see Dunworth et al, Abstract, and see figures 1, 2, 2A-2C, where software interface and computer networks for the invention are mentioned/depicted. It is inherent that “computer systems” and “software interfaces” are implemented on computer-readable mediums having computer executable instructions for performing their tasks.)

As to claim 7, Dunworth et al as modified teaches wherein the plurality of listed regions (see figure 12) comprises at least one ZIP code (see Dunworth et al, column 24, lines 28-39, and see figure 17.)

As to claim 8, Dunworth et al teaches a computer-readable medium having stored thereon a data structure (see column 4, line 66 through column 5, line 2), comprising:

a first data field (see column 18, lines 55-59, where “data fields” is read on “each of the databases described”) containing data representing information about a merchant (see column 24, lines 28-39, where “yellow pages” database is explained, and see column 37, lines 36-65); and

a second data field associated with the first data field (see column 18, lines 55-59, where “data fields” is read on “each of the databases described”) and containing location binding data (see column 24, lines 34-49, where “location binding information” is read on “address”, “city”, state”, and “zip code” fields”) representing a region in which the merchant provides service (see column 18, lines 60-66, where “geographic database” is explained, and see column 31, line 61 through column 36, line 25);

such that a search request (see column 3, lines 1-2) seeking a merchant that services a particular region is compared to the second data field to determine from the location binding data therein whether the merchant represented in the first data field services that particular region (see column 3, lines 6-14), and if so, at least some of the information about the merchant contained in the first data field may be returned in response to the search request (see column 16, lines 17-26, where “merchant” is read on “the specified value”.)

Dunworth et al does not teach a region in which the merchant does not include a physical location.

Art Unit: 2175

Getchius et al teaches a method and system for performing online data queries, in which he teaches a region in which the merchant does not include a physical location (see column 18, lines 1-7, where “the merchant not having a physical location” is read on “virtual business”.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dunworth et al to include a region in which the merchant does not include a physical location.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dunworth et al by the teaching of Getchius et al, because including a region in which the merchant does not include a physical location, would enable the user to obtain information about a business or a merchant who provides goods or services to the area but does not have a physical presence in that region. For example, it would make it possible to perform a search on, and obtain information about merchandise seller, “AMAZON.COM”, without AMAZON’s having to be physically present in the region the search is initiated from and/or the goods/services are delivered to.

As to claim 9, Dunworth et al as modified teaches the structure further comprising a third data field, associated with the first data field (see Dunworth et al, column 18, lines 55-59, where “data fields” is read on “each of the databases described”), and including additional information regarding the merchant (see Dunworth et al, column 10, lines 16-18) but not having a physical location in the region (see Getchius et al, column 18, lines 1-7, where “the merchant not having a physical location in the region” is read on “virtual business”.)

As to claim 10, Dunworth et al as modified teaches wherein the third data field comprises text that indicates that the merchant provides service to the region but does not have a physical location in the region (see Dunworth et al, column 5, lines 40-65, where “customization of the topical information” is taught, and see figures 11 and 15.)

As to claim 11, Dunworth et al as modified teaches wherein the third data field comprises a glyph that indicates that the merchant provides service to the region but does not have a physical location in the region (see Dunworth et al, column 19, lines 64-67, where “glyph” is read on “graphical image”, and see figure 9.)

As to claim 12, Dunworth et al teaches a computer-readable medium having stored thereon a data structure (see column 4, line 66 through column 5, line 2), comprising:

a first data field (see column 18, lines 55-59, where “data fields” is read on “each of the databases described”) containing data representing information about a merchant (see column 24, lines 28-39, where “yellow pages” database is explained, and see column 37, lines 36-65);

a second data field associated with the first data field (see column 18, lines 55-59, where “data fields” is read on “each of the databases described”) and containing data representing information regarding the merchant providing service to a region (see column 24, lines 28-39, where “yellow pages” database is explained, and see column 37, lines 36-65); and

Art Unit: 2175

a third data field associated with the first data field and containing location binding data (see column 24, lines 34-49, where "location binding information" is read on "address", "city", "state", and "zip code" fields") representing a region in which the merchant provides service (see column 18, lines 60-66, where "geographic database" is explained, and see column 31, line 61 through column 36, line 25);

such that a search request (see column 3, lines 1-2) seeking a merchant that services a particular region is compared to the third data field to determine from the location binding data therein whether the merchant represented in the first data field services that particular region (see column 3, lines 6-14), and if so, at least some of the information about the merchant contained in the second data field may be returned in response to the search request (see column 16, lines 17-26, where "merchant" is read on "the specified value".)

Dunworth et al does not teach a merchant not having a physical location in the region.

Getchius et al teaches a method and system for performing online data queries, in which he teaches a merchant not having a physical location in the region (see column 18, lines 1-7, where "the merchant not having a physical location" is read on "virtual business".)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dunworth et al to include a merchant not having a physical location in the region.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dunworth et al by the teaching of Getchius et al, because including a merchant not having a physical location in the region, would enable the user to obtain information about a business or a merchant who provides goods or services to

Art Unit: 2175

the area but does not have a physical presence in that region. For example, it would make it possible to perform a search on, and obtain information about merchandise seller, "AMAZON.COM", without AMAZON's having to be physically present in the region the search is initiated from and/or the goods/services are delivered to.

As to claim 13, Dunworth et al as modified teaches wherein the second data field comprises text that indicates that the merchant provides service to the region (see Dunworth et al, column 5, lines 40-65, where "customization of the topical information" is taught, and see figures 11 and 15) but does not have a physical location in the region (see Getchius et al, column 18, lines 1-7, where "the merchant not having a physical location" is read on "virtual business".)

As to claim 14, Dunworth et al as modified teaches wherein the second data field comprises a glyph that indicates that the merchant provides service to the region but does not have a physical location in the region (see Dunworth et al, column 19, lines 64-67, where "glyph" is read on "graphical image", and see figure 9.)

As to claim 15, Dunworth et al teaches a method in a computer system (see column 2, lines 49-52), comprising:

submitting a search query directed to businesses, the search query including a designation of a region (see column 14, lines 14-27);

receiving a business listing in response to the search query, the business listing being associated with a merchant that provides service to the region (see column 9, line 55 through column 10, line 6); and

receiving, along with the business listing, information regarding the fact that the merchant services the region (see column 5, lines 40-65, where “customization of the topical information” is taught, and see figures 11 and 15. Also see column 19, lines 64-67, where “graphical image” is taught, and see figure 9.)

Dunworth et al does not teach where a merchant does not have a physical location in the region.

Getchius et al teaches a method and system for performing online data queries, in which he teaches a merchant not having a physical location in the region (see column 18, lines 1-7, where “the merchant not having a physical location” is read on “virtual business”.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dunworth et al to include a merchant that does not have a physical location in the region.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dunworth et al by the teaching of Getchius et al, because including a merchant that does not have a physical location in the region, would enable the user to obtain information about a business or a merchant who provides goods or services to the area but does not have a physical presence in that region. For example, it would make it possible to perform a search on, and obtain information about merchandise

Art Unit: 2175

seller, "AMAZON.COM", without AMAZON's having to be physically present in the region the search is initiated from and/or the goods/services are delivered to.

As to claim 16, Dunworth et al as modified teaches the method further comprising displaying the information along with the business listing (see Dunworth et al, figures 9, 11, and 15.)

As to claim 17, Dunworth et al as modified teaches wherein the information comprises text (see Dunworth et al, column 5, lines 40-65, where "customization of the topical information" is taught, and see figures 11 and 15.)

As to claim 18, Dunworth et al as modified teaches wherein the information comprises text and a glyph (see Dunworth et al, figures 9, 11, and 15.)

As to claim 19, Dunworth et al as modified teaches wherein the information comprises a glyph (see Dunworth et al, column 19, lines 64-67, where "glyph" is read on "graphical image", and see figure 9.)

As to claim 20, Dunworth et al teaches a computer system (see column 2, lines 49-52) comprising:

a data store for maintaining location binding information (see column 24, lines 34-49, where "location binding information" is read on "address", "city", state", and "zip code"

Art Unit: 2175

fields") for merchants that provide service to a region (see column 24, lines 28-39, where "yellow pages" database is explained, and see column 37, lines 36-65), at least one merchant having location binding information for a region (see figure 11);

data entry tools for entering the information in the data store (see column 3; lines 1-8, where the "organizer comprises a database". It is inherent for databases to have data entry tools for obtaining the data for storage.)

Dunworth et al does not teach merchants that do not include a physical location in the region; and does not teach an application programming interface for ensuring that the information is stored with each merchant entered by the data entry tools.

Getchius et al teaches a method and system for performing online data queries, in which he teaches merchants that do not include a physical location in the region (see column 18, lines 1-7, where "the merchant not having a physical location" is read on "virtual business"), and further teaches an application programming interface for ensuring that the information is stored with each merchant entered by the data entry tools (see column 28, lines 26-28, and see column 58, lines 33-49, where "database preparations" and "validity" of database updates are taught.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dunworth et al to include merchants that do not include a physical location in the region; and to include an application programming interface for ensuring that the information is stored with each merchant entered by the data entry tools.

Art Unit: 2175

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dunworth et al by the teaching of Getchius et al, because including merchants that do not include a physical location in the region, would enable the user to obtain information about a business or a merchant who provides goods or services to the area but does not have a physical presence in that region. For example, it would make it possible to perform a search on, and obtain information about merchandise seller, "AMAZON.COM", without AMAZON's having to be physically present in the region the search is initiated from and/or the goods/services are delivered to. Also, including an application programming interface for ensuring that the information is stored with each merchant entered by the data entry tools, would allow the user to verify the data entered for each merchant and would further verify and validate database updates to ensure accurate merchant/business information is displayed to the users.

As to claim 21, Dunworth et al as modified teaches wherein the application programming interface (see Getchius et al, column 26, lines 26-28) includes rules that require each merchant in the data store to be identified as one of a mobile, territorial, or delivery type merchant (see Getchius et al, column 14, lines 3-8, where "identifying merchant in the data store" is read on "tags identifying key data items for each business", and see column 28, lines 33-58, where "rule" is read on "mapping a string corresponding to a query name", and identifying merchant in the data store" is read on "type of business service".)

As to claim 22, Dunworth et al as modified teaches wherein the application programming interface (see Getchius et al, column 26, lines 26-28) include rules that specify whether each merchant identified in the data store requires an associated glyph (see Getchius et al, figure 15, and see column 55, lines 10-17, where “glyph” is read on “multimedia blob data, such graphics, video, audio, job applets”.)

As to claim 23, Dunworth et al as modified teaches wherein the application programming interface (see Getchius et al, column 26, lines 26-28) includes rules that specify whether each merchant identified in the data store requires an associated text (see Getchius et al, figure 15, and see column 55, lines 10-17, where “associated text” is read on “structured textual information, such as business name and address”.)

As to claim 24, Dunworth et al as modified teaches a computer readable medium having computer executable instructions for performing the method of claim 15 (see Dunworth et al, Abstract, and see figures 1, 2, 2A-2C, where software interface and computer networks for the invention are mentioned/depicted. It is inherent that “computer systems” and “software interfaces” are implemented on computer-readable mediums having computer executable instructions for performing their tasks.)

As to claim 25, Dunworth et al teaches in a computer system, a method (see column 2, lines 49-51) comprising:

receiving a request (see column 3, lines 1-2) for a merchant within a particular region (see column 5, lines 22-24, and see figure 15);

searching a database (see column 3, lines 2-8) containing information associated with merchants located within the region (see column 8, lines 37-44, and see column 24, lines 28-39, where “yellow pages” database is explained, and see column 37, lines 36-65); and

returning information regarding the merchants within the region (see column 16, lines 17-26, where “merchant” is read on “the specified value”.)

For the teachings of: “returning information regarding merchants outside the region, the information regarding merchants outside the region indicating that the merchant provides services to the region but does not have a physical location in the region”, the applicant is kindly directed to the remarks and discussions made in claim 1 above.

As to claim 26, Dunworth et al as modified teaches the method further comprising maintaining location binding information (see Dunworth et al, column 24, lines 34-49, where “location binding information” is read on “address”, “city”, state”, and “zip code” fields”) associating a merchant outside the region with a particular region (see Dunworth et al, column 8, lines 37-44, and see column 24, lines 28-39, where “yellow pages” database is explained, and see column 37, lines 36-65.)

Art Unit: 2175

As to claim 27, Dunworth et al as modified teaches wherein maintaining location binding information (see Dunworth et al, column 24, lines 34-49, where “location binding information” is read on “address”, “city”, state”, and “zip code” fields”) comprises writing an entry into a database including information about the particular region (see Dunworth et al, column 8, line 59 through column 9, line 4, and see figure 12) and information about the merchant (see Dunworth et al, column 9, lines 55-67, where “merchant” is read on “business”, and see figure 18.)

As to claim 28, Dunworth et al as modified teaches the method further comprising returning a glyph associated with the information regarding each merchant outside the region (see Dunworth et al, column 19, lines 64-67, where “glyph” is read on “graphical image”, and see figure 9.)

As to claim 29, Dunworth et al as modified teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions (see Dunworth et al, Abstract, and see figures 1, 2, 2A-2C, where software interface and computer networks for the invention are mentioned/depicted. It is inherent that “computer systems” and “software interfaces” are implemented on computer-readable mediums having computer executable instructions for performing their tasks) for performing the method of claim 25 (applicant is directed to remarks and discussions made in claim 25 above.)

***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments filed on 14-October-2003 with respect to the rejected claims in view of the cited references have been fully considered but are not found persuasive and/or they have already been addressed in the previous office actions:

In response to the applicant's arguments that "Dunworth teaches that a topic and geographic area are searched, and to locate a business, the business must have a physical presence within the geographic area", the arguments have been fully considered but are not found persuasive, because nowhere in his invention does Dunworth et al require a physical presence of the business in a given geographic region. In fact, Dunworth et al, in the Abstract of his invention states: "The geography database allows the user to browse through different geographic areas of which are ordered hierarchically, while the local content database includes information about general goods and services available within a given geographic location". The teaching of goods and services available within a given geographic location is not an indication that the business must have a physical presence in the region, as long as such business provides the "goods and services" to the region.

In response to the applicant's arguments that "Dunworth fails to disclose the concept of maintaining information that allows a business to be located when that business that does not have a physical location within a geographic area specified in a request", the arguments have been fully considered but are not found persuasive, because Dunworth et al teaches: "the user is presented with the option of accessing topically organized information from among several

topic selections, wherein the topical information is defined by the fact that the topical information is associated with a particular geographical area” (see column 2, lines 45-49). The fact that Dunworth et al teaches accessing topically organized information, and that the topical information is associated with a particular geographical area, proves that with the invention of Dunworth et al, business can be identified if they have “topics” associating them with a particular geographic area. This “topic” can be the “availability” of the “goods and services” from that business within the geographic area, binding or “associating” the business with the region without requiring a physical presence, as discussed above.

In response to the applicant’s arguments that “Dunworth teaches manually expanding and contracting the geographic search area, which requires significant user interaction”, the arguments have been fully considered but are not found persuasive, because Dunworth et al is simply allowing the user to expand or identify the region (geographic location) for which locating a goods/service provider is desired. This is very much in line with the applicant’s teaching of “receiving a request directed to a particular region”. In this teaching, the applicant relies on the user for submitting a request for a particular region. The submission of user’s request has to be indeed “manual”, therefore, requiring user interaction.

In response to the applicant’s arguments regarding “motivations” in combining the prior arts, the arguments have been addressed in the previous office action, paper No. 7.

Art Unit: 2175

In response to the applicant's arguments that Dunworth et al "is expressly geographic, and not topical, in nature", the arguments have been fully considered but are not found persuasive in view of Dunworth et al's teaching of "accessing topically organized information from among several topic selections" (see column 2, lines 45-49) as discussed above.

In response to the applicant's arguments regarding "obviousness" using hindsight in view of the teachings of the applicants, the arguments have been addressed in the previous office action, paper No. 7.

*Conclusion*

7. Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tony Mahmoudi whose telephone number is (703) 305-4887. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays from 08:00 am to 04:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici, can be reached at (703) 305-3830.

tm

October 31, 2003



DOV POPOVICI  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100